

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 661

HE 016 556

TITLE Is Graduate Education Fulfilling Its Responsibilities to Primary and Secondary Education? A Panel Discussion.

INSTITUTION Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE May 82

NOTE 33p.; Report originally presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States (21st, Washington, DC, December 2-4, 1981).

AVAILABLE FROM The Council of Graduate School in the U.S., One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *College Role; *College School Cooperation; Educational Research; Education Majors; *Elementary Secondary Education; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The question of whether graduate education is fulfilling its responsibilities to primary and secondary education is discussed in a panel discussion by the following professionals: Ernest L. Boyer, Gregory R. Anrig, Dean C. Corrigan, Patricia Albjerg Graham, and F. James Rutherford. It is suggested that responsibilities of graduate schools should include: assuring excellent preparation of personnel to staff elementary and secondary schools, providing effective instruction for teachers and administrators while they are employed in the schools, supporting and conducting research that will help to improve local educational practice, and encouraging talented persons to enter and remain in primary and secondary education. It is noted that at major graduate institutions, the colleges and departments of education are usually assigned second or third class status. Furthermore, it is claimed that the emphasis of research at most universities has been more on basic psychological and sociological understanding than on more applied research related to the conduct of teaching in the schools. Ways in which a university can share its resources with the schools and the issue of the shortage of qualified teachers are also addressed. (SW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED234661

A Panel Discussion

Is Graduate Education Fulfilling Its Responsibilities To Primary and Secondary Education?

CGS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Council of Graduate
Schools in the U.S.*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S.
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1173
202/223-3791

AE 016556

1982 BOARD OF DIRECTORS COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

W. Dexter Whitehead, Chairman, University of Virginia
Paul A. Albrecht, Past Chairman, Claremont Graduate School
Wimberly C. Royster, Chairman-Elect, University of Kentucky
Mary Ann Carroll (1983), Indiana State University
Alison P. Casarett (1984), Cornell University
Dale R. Comstock (1984), Central Washington University
Robert E. Gordon (1984), University of Notre Dame
Benjamin F. Hudson (1982), Atlanta University
Jules B. LaPidus (1983), The Ohio State University
Elizabeth L. McMahan (1982), East Tennessee State University
George S. Mumford (1983), Tufts University
C. J. Nyman (1982), Washington State University
Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., Ex Officio, Council of Graduate Schools

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

W. Dexter Whitehead, Chairman, University of Virginia
Paul A. Albrecht, Past Chairman, Claremont Graduate School
Wimberly C. Royster, Chairman-Elect, University of Kentucky
Mary Ann Carroll, Indiana State University
Alison P. Casarett, Cornell University
Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., Ex Officio, Council of Graduate Schools

Is Graduate Education Fulfilling Its Responsibilities To Primary and Secondary Education?

A Panel Discussion Featuring

ERNEST L. BOYER

President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement
of Teaching (*Moderator*)

GREGORY R. ANRIG

President, Educational Testing Service

DEAN C. CORRIGAN

Dean, School of Education, Texas A&M University

PATRICIA ALBJERG GRAHAM

Charles Warren Professor of History of Education and
Dean of the School of Education, Harvard University
Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center
for Scholars

Former Director, National Institute of Education

F. JAMES RUTHERFORD

Chief Education Officer, American Association for the
Advancement of Science; Former Assistant Secretary for
Research and Improvement and Assistant Director for
Science Education, National Science Foundation

Originally presented at the 21st annual meeting of the
Council of Graduate Schools in the United States,
December 2-4, 1981, Washington, D.C.

Foreword

The condition of education in our elementary and secondary schools should be a matter of concern to the graduate community. The fact is that all measurements of learning by the students in these stages of their education have revealed alarming evidence of the lack of accomplishments in basic skills—reading, writing and arithmetic. Furthermore, there is evidence of a growing disenchantment by students with science and mathematics at the secondary level. Surveys confirm that during the past decade there has been at the junior and senior high school levels a decline in both the quantity of subject material taken by students, and the quality, as reflected by lower levels of achievement. Unless we change this trend, we will drift toward a scientifically and technologically illiterate society. One distinguished educator has expressed the opinion that unless we improve upon education at the secondary level, we might as well forget about graduate education!

Admittedly the causes for the general decline in education at the elementary and secondary levels, and particularly science and mathematics in the high schools, are complex. They include socio-economic factors and cultural conditions as well as national attitudes.

Since it is in the graduate school that our teachers and the teachers of teachers are educated and trained, it was judged appropriate that we ask the question "Is graduate education fulfilling its responsibilities to primary and secondary education?" Five distinguished educators were invited to address this question at the 21st annual meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S. Their presentations constitute the substance of this report.

Michael J. Pelczar, Jr.
President

May, 1982

Is Graduate Education Fulfilling Its Responsibilities to Primary and Secondary Education?

Opening Remarks by Ernest L. Boyer

It's absolutely clear . . . that the conditions of schooling in the United States will inevitably determine the well-being of the nation's intellectual community in the decades just ahead.

On behalf of my colleagues at the table, I should like to thank you for inviting us to discuss a topic that in some ways seems a bit misplaced at a meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools.

Indeed, in looking at the title of this session, one might even ask the prior question: Is there a responsibility on the part of graduate schools towards secondary education? Until recently, the condition of public education seemed far removed from the day-to-day agenda of graduate schools and their administration. Indeed, even today if we were to ask those in attendance to rank-order your day-by-day worries, I would be surprised if secondary education would even make it on to the paper.

I say this not to be critical. There is, of course, a hierarchy of concerns in any administration, and we begin our discussion today with the recognition that helping to strengthen, if not save, secondary schooling in this country is not the *primary* obligation of those who direct graduate studies in the nation's distinguished universities.

On the other hand, I consider it a matter of statesmanship on the part of this body that you have devoted a session to reflect a bit on an issue that quite frankly will impinge on the health and well-being of us all.

Just a word or two to put the topic in perspective. We have now approximately 45 million children in the nation's schools. These students move along inexorably to what we call higher learning; and it's absolutely clear, as night follows day, that the conditions of schooling in the United States will inevitably determine the well-being of the nation's intellectual community in the decades just ahead.

Second, you can't be alive and breathing in this country without having some sense of concern about the status of schooling in the United States. During my days in government, I was much closer to the schooling picture, and I left my federal post concerned, if not genuinely alarmed, not just by what I thought were the internal erosions in the schools, but perhaps even more substantial erosions in public confidence.

I suspect that the next few years will be a watershed in the nation's strategies toward public education; there is an anxiety and a lack of confidence in schools that seems much more deep-seated now than at any time in my memory, certainly, and perhaps in this century.

Somehow we have lost confidence that schooling represents America's most essential commitment. And added to that malaise is a well-formed tactic on the part of many to advocate options to public education. We may have a dangerous chemistry brewing. At the very time that our schools seem to be under special stress, there is a growing body of public support for the notion that we can, through some yet unclear method, define an adequate option so that we need no longer provide—at public expense—universal and equitable access to education.

If this movement ever takes firm hold, we will be left with a tragic two-part system—the one will provide an escape for the affluent while still tens of millions of young people will move through a system that ill serves their long-term needs.

One final point concerns a disturbing demographic shift. Increasing numbers of our young people are black and Hispanic; white America is aging. And so we have not only a division in age but also a division of race and culture that could make public schools battlegrounds rejected by those who historically have the most affluence.

Only 27 percent of white Americans are 18 years of age or younger, while 40 percent of Hispanics and a third or more of all black Americans are 18 years of age or younger. To reject this large majority of our urban young people as a matter of public policy is to bankrupt the future of the country.

I say all of this to say that as academic leaders, graduate school deans, Americans who care about the country — the agenda item this afternoon is most worthy of our investigation.

I now turn to our four panelists who come to us with distinction and broad perspective. Pat Graham will be followed by Jim

Rutherford, to be followed by Dean Corrigan, to be followed by Greg Anrig.

Comment: Patricia Albjerg Graham

What professor of law at your university would encourage her capable son to become a high school teacher? What professor of business in your university would encourage his talented daughter to exercise her managerial skills as a high school principal? . . . Until those of us in the university consider teaching and administration in elementary and secondary schools as important and as challenging as the other fields which we assist our students and graduates to enter and pursue, we will be bereft of talent in those vital institutions, and we will have ourselves to blame.

Is graduate education fulfilling its responsibility to primary and secondary education? My answer is unequivocal — no.

In many ways, however, that answer, however firm, fair, or accurate, is neither informative nor significant, because were I asked if graduate education is a principal cause of the difficulties in which primary and secondary education now find themselves, I would answer that query with the same unequivocal no.

The origin of the problems facing primary and secondary education in this country today does not lie principally with the inadequacies of the graduate schools, either those specializing in education or those in the liberal arts or other professional fields. Rather, the fundamental cause of the problem facing primary and secondary education, but particularly secondary education, lies with the uncertainty of purpose of these institutions. Simply put, they are not sure what is expected of them. What are they supposed to be doing besides keeping youth off the streets and out of the work force? Neither of those objectives do they accomplish with great success; youngsters stroll through neighborhoods during school hours, and serve hamburgers at the local McDonald's in most American communities.

Many elementary and secondary school personnel are unclear about what their other obligations to these children are, and they are not aided in their dilemma by the conflicting guidelines they receive from local school boards, pressure groups, state and federal authorities, and a vocal populace who criticize their efforts.

Nearly everyone would agree that elementary schools have an obligation to provide instruction in what we now call the basic skills, and nearly everyone believes that all children, within a broad definition of normality, can learn to read, write, add and subtract. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence that children in elementary schools today, especially in the primary grades, are doing exactly that. The National Assessment of Educational Progress reports continuing gains for nine-year-olds in reading since 1967. There is a wealth of other evidence to suggest that our primary school-aged children today are probably doing better than children at that age ever have in terms of learning in schools.

A large number of city school systems, including New York and Boston, report encouraging test results in reading for their elementary students. Similarly positive reports for secondary school pupils' achievements are hard to find on a widespread basis.

I think that there are a variety of reasons for that. First of all, what is taught in the secondary schools is a whole lot harder to learn than what is taught in the elementary schools.

Second, the children in the elementary school do not have long records of personal failure to overcome as do some in the secondary schools.

Third, parents have a much more direct and potent influence on their elementary school children than they do on their sometimes awkward and rebellious adolescents.

Finally, the rigid and departmentalized structure of many high schools makes more difficult the introduction of and concentration on school-wide academic goals.

These concerns, then, of elementary and secondary schools, but particularly of secondary schools, are significant and do not originate with the graduate schools. But even if the problem does not start with the graduate schools, even if they are not the cause, what responsibilities do the graduate schools have to

primary and secondary education and are they fulfilling them?

It seems to me that responsibilities seem crucial and, in my judgment, the graduate schools on the whole, but with some important exceptions, are not fulfilling them as well as they might.

Our first responsibility is to assure excellent preparation of personnel to staff those institutions both as teachers and administrators.

Our second is to provide effective instruction for these teachers and administrators while they are employed in the schools.

Third, we must support and conduct research that will help to improve local educational practice.

And fourth, we must believe in the efficacy of the primary and secondary education enterprise and to encourage talented persons to enter and to remain in that field.

Let me say a word about each of these.

First, we need to assure excellent preparation of personnel to staff those institutions, both as teachers and administrators. Such assurance of excellent preparation will not come easily, as voices around the country from the Secretary of Education T. H. Bell to disappointed parents and employers regularly reveal.

Universities now admit students with lower than average test scores to enter elementary and secondary education, as Gary Sykes has documented in a recent National Institute of Education study. Special and powerful curricular additives will be required if these future educators are to become themselves knowledgeable enough to educate others. Few institutions have taken this responsibility seriously. Driven as most of us are by the pressures of student credit hours or FTE, we are reluctant to turn away students who seek to enroll in our courses. Even more, we are not likely to discourage those who do enroll by increasing the workload beyond that which is customary for the program.

In graduate schools of education, caught as many are by declining enrollments and highly tenured faculty, this problem is acute. Central university administrations, therefore, must address these particular needs for raising the academic standards for teaching, even if that means reducing enrollments, and must imaginatively seek ways to support a graduate school of education that successfully undertakes such a difficult but necessary course.

While realizing the difficulty of citing numbers on nonidentical bases, Gary Sykes has observed that in 1978 the average cost per academic year of instruction in teacher education was \$927. That year the average national per-pupil expenditure in elementary and secondary schools was half again as much, \$1,400, and the following year, the average expenditure for higher education was \$2,300, which is 2½ times as much. So you see that the expenditure level in teacher education is almost embarrassingly modest compared to other instructional costs.

Secondly, we need to provide effective instruction for those teachers and administrators now employed in the schools. Graduate schools and elementary and secondary schools need to undertake more discussions on just what kinds of useful supplementary instruction the universities can provide teachers and administrators. Gone are the days when extension courses provided in one ghastly three-hour shot on a Tuesday night in a remote high school classroom will be of any use to anyone for anything other than an incremental salary increase based on the in-service training in teaching the extension course.

More imaginative use of university facilities and programs might involve collaborative offerings of the School of Education with other graduate programs, such as public policy, business, public health, and even liberal arts. Opportunities for the beleaguered humanities faculty may exist here. Not only might teachers be attracted, but teams from the school system, including persons with responsibility for articulation between elementary and secondary education—as well as others with more general responsibility for the school system—might occasionally come. We in the university need to consult with our colleagues in the schools about what they seek from such instruction, and we need to honestly evaluate what we have to offer.

Third, we need to support and conduct research that will help to improve local educational practice. There is considerable evidence that university-based research has actually been helpful in explaining the ways children learn to read so that more effective teaching strategies can be designed. That is the good side of the research-to-improved practice theme. The more common experience is that university-based research focuses on problems of interest to the university researcher and uses methodologies

appropriate to his academic discipline. Often the results of that research have been of little interest or use to the school personnel who made their institutions available as testing grounds for the researcher.

That situation must change, and there is some indication that it is changing. Recently, Stanford President Donald Kennedy announced that he intended to co-chair, with Dean Myron Atkin of Stanford's School of Education, a committee whose goal will be to establish a program through which all of Stanford's behavioral scientists might use College of Education facilities as laboratories in which to conduct their investigations. If the group at Stanford recognizes the contributions to be made through this difficult but essential collaboration between researcher and practitioner, that program might serve as a model for the rest of us of how universities through research can truly promote improvements in practice.

Fourth and finally, we need to believe in the efficacy of the elementary/secondary education enterprise and to encourage talented persons to enter and to remain in that field. In my view, this is the most important and most difficult responsibility of higher education to elementary and secondary education.

Belief in the inferiority of pre-college education and the equivalent inferiority of persons who engage in education below the college level is so intense and so widespread among university personnel, both in schools of education and outside, that most intelligent, sensible undergraduates and graduate students, simply avoid employment in those institutions if at all possible. It has been shown, in fact, that the most academically able teachers are leaving the field in droves.

What professor of law at your university would encourage her capable son to become a high school teacher? What professor of business in your university would encourage his talented daughter to exercise her managerial skills as a high school principal? How many professors of education encourage their most gifted students to remain in the elementary and secondary schools, rather than move to the more prestigious and lucrative fields of corporate education and educational policy?

Until those of us in the university consider teaching and administering in elementary and secondary schools as important and as challenging as the other fields which we assist our students

and graduates to enter and pursue, we will be bereft of talent in those vital institutions, and we will have ourselves to blame.

Comment: F. James Rutherford

Quality standards ought to be set by the nation's greatest universities which, generally speaking, are our major research universities. . . . University faculties and administrators have simply failed over the years to pay the same kind of attention and to apply the same level of standards to their schools of education that they do to other parts of their institutions. Sometimes benign neglect turns out to have malignant consequences.

In response to the general question of this symposium on whether or not graduate universities are fulfilling their responsibilities towards elementary and secondary education, I would like to give a general answer. No. Not at all. Now, of course, given a system in which the graduate universities are so different from each other and have such different histories, any generalization is necessarily wrong in many instances. Some universities at some times have been concerned about and taken active steps in promoting the quality of pre-college education. But in the aggregate, I stick by my generalization.

What I mean by this response is not so much that the universities set ambitious goals related to elementary and secondary education and then fail to reach them. Rather, I mean to claim that the universities fail to set appropriate goals for themselves. For the most part, it seems to me, research universities have had no more than casual concern for the policies, practices, and conditions affecting elementary and secondary school teaching. University faculty members complain a great deal about the quality of pre-college education, but bemoaning the inadequacies of elementary and secondary education is a far cry from having a collective and institutional commitment to helping the schools be better. Given the obvious self-interest that graduate universities have in the quality of education that occurs at lower levels,

it is surprising that they would be so standoffish. But they seem to be, nevertheless.

This lack of concern, this failure to accept major and ongoing responsibilities for helping to improve elementary and secondary education, manifests itself in critical ways. Today I would like to suggest that there are four ways in which the performance of our universities has been less than stellar. These are: the training of elementary and secondary school teachers and school administrators; the conduct of research related to learning and teaching in the pre-college grades; the promotion of positive attitudes on the part of future leaders toward elementary and secondary education and the conduct of community services related to public education.

First, about teacher and administrator training. It is the colleges and universities of the land that educate and train people who teach in and operate our schools. The quality of school personnel therefore depends not only upon state credentialing laws and regulations, but also upon how well the universities perform their training function. The record is not impressive.

To be sure, teachers and administrators are produced in literally hundreds of different institutions, from the very small to the very largest. One can argue, however, that the quality standards ought to be set by the nation's greatest universities which, generally speaking, are our major research universities. It is not that these institutions should produce the largest volume of teachers and administrators for our schools, but rather that they should produce the very best. The quality of their programs in teacher and administrator education could then set the standard for other institutions to try to achieve. This is the way things happen, by way of comparison, in the sciences.

But is this what we find? Clearly not. At our major graduate institutions the schools and colleges and departments of education are inevitably assigned second or third class status. This does not come about because of venality or by way of some deliberate policy, but rather by virtue of neglect. University faculties and administrators have simply failed over the years to pay the same kind of attention and to apply the same level of standards to their schools of education that they do to other parts of their institutions. Sometimes benign neglect turns out to have malignant consequences.

In most university academic departments there are unending complaints about the training of teachers, the usual charge being that future high school teachers take mostly lightweight education courses and neglect to study the subjects that they will eventually teach. The real need, however, is not for putting down teacher training with such charges (which, incidentally, are often not even true), but rather for each university to build an enterprise that does the kind of job that the entire faculty would regard as first rate. It takes time and it takes an investment of university resources, but it is achievable.

One final note about the failure of our graduate research universities to pay attention to elementary and secondary teaching. During the last five years many of our most prestigious universities have withdrawn from teacher education. They may still have a school or college of education but they have turned them into research centers concerned primarily with psychology, sociology, and educational policy. The work of such research units can be important in the long run but it is surely not the same thing as turning some of the attention of the university to the crucial matter of preparing the next generation of teachers and school administrators. It is as though our best schools of engineering were to turn away from the training of engineers in order to concentrate on doing research in physics, chemistry, and engineering policy.

The next failure I would like to point to has to do with educational research. First let me say that I believe considerable progress has been made in the last decade on this front. Many of our schools of education at the research universities have strengthened considerably their research capability. As I see it, however, this research focus has been unnecessarily skewed. The emphasis at most universities has been rather more on basic psychological and sociological understanding than on more applied research related to the conduct of teaching in the schools.

The need for university-based educational R&D is great, since the schools themselves rarely have research capability. Schools are such an important part of our society that they ought to constitute a *major* research domain for our universities. In order to reach the point where research knowledge can help improve practice, the universities must, I believe, become better at two things.

The first, as I have already implied, is to make sure that there is a sufficient investment in applied research, research that can conceivably pay off in practical ways and be seen to pay off by teachers and administrators. The second is to train school people who will pay attention to research findings and be sophisticated in applying them. The best universities should be showing us how to train teachers and school administrators who know their subjects, who are immensely skilled at teaching and administration, and who understand the value and applications of research knowledge.

Universities have human and other resources that are simply unavailable in even the best school systems . . . A university that cares about the quality of elementary and secondary education will surely look for ways to share its resources with the schools.

Turning to the matter of attitudes, we should first recognize that our universities, and to an increasing degree our graduate universities, educate and train our nation's leaders. Indeed, the strength of the American university comes not alone from producing research scientists and scholars but also the citizens who will go into business, law, politics, education, and every other aspect of our society. These leaders are, to use Harrison Shull's marvelous phrase, "the shapers of our laws, the conveyors of our news, the managers of our enterprises." What these future leaders come to believe about elementary and secondary education and about the people who teach and run the schools is very important. It is important because it will influence their behavior in their own domain of work, which in turn will have a significant impact on public education.

It would seem that if our universities cared more about the quality of elementary and secondary education in the country, they would try to help these graduates have positive and useful attitudes about the schools. If the universities really regarded high school teaching, for example, as an appropriate profession for talented people, then they would make that clear to their students. Instead, of course, many of our leading universities tend

to promote just the opposite attitude. Bright students in any field in the university are quickly made to realize that if they are good they should not consider a career as an elementary or secondary school teacher. University faculties consider such jobs to be of a lesser kind and to be undertaken only if there are not better opportunities. So while our university faculties may pay lip service to the value of pre-college education, what they transmit to the students is that the system is not important enough to be considered along with other professions such as medicine, research, law, engineering, or almost anything else.

Finally, there is the matter of community service in education. The town-gown problem is one of long standing and is frequently thought of in terms of the relationship between college students and a community's permanent residents, or as a question of how much the university contributes to the city in lieu of taxes. Those are interesting and important matters to be sure, but the real question is: what should a university do in order to be a good citizen in its own locality? Surely there are many things that universities can, and in fact do, do to contribute to the quality of life in their own towns and cities. Generally speaking, however, the universities and the university facilities do little to help the local school systems. Universities have human and other resources that are simply unavailable in even the best school systems.

A university that cares about the quality of elementary and secondary education will surely look for ways to share its resources with the schools. There are dozens of ways in which this can be done if only the effort is made on a large enough scale. Campus facilities such as libraries and laboratories can be made available to selected students, and indeed this is the most common kind of university contribution to the schools. But much more is possible. University faculty members can act as mentors for talented high school students, visit the schools frequently to do special lectures, invite classes to their laboratories, and work on informal bases with teachers to help to improve the curriculum and the teacher's understanding of new developments in the field. Even without external funds, universities can provide some in-service training for teachers on campus or in the school. Many more imaginative ideas have been tested and found to work in one place or another. My claim is that rarely at any given univer-

sity have many of these techniques been used in a planned effort to help the schools on a partnership basis.

There is one additional opportunity for community service in education that is generally missed by university faculty members. The day-to-day policies of the public schools are determined largely by community members who express their will through school boards. The best way for university scholars to have influence in the schools of America would be to participate in that community decision-making process. More university professors should run for office as school board members and many more should systematically attend school board meetings in order to participate in discussions relating to policy issues in the schools. It is not that university members bring superior wisdom; rather it is that they bring special knowledge and perspectives from a particular sector of our society that should be part of the mix. Furthermore, if more university educators participated in community affairs such as this, it would help raise the status of public education and contribute to the ability of the system to attract better qualified people in the future.

In all of this I do not intend to argue that universities should change much or that they should substitute one set of goals for another. I am only claiming that the nation's educational system will be greatly improved to the extent that the graduate universities in the country accept more responsibility for helping to raise the quality of elementary and secondary education.

Comment: Dean C. Corrigan

It is imperative . . . that new directions in teacher education and improvement of quality programs be embedded in and consonant with equally innovative directions in school renewal.

Even if graduate college deans were ready to make the preparation of educators the top priority in their graduate schools and to begin in earnest to provide higher quality teacher preparation, I think that that would be dealing with only half of the problem. Just reforming programs in universities is not going to be enough. The educational system will not improve merely by changing programs of teacher education in colleges and universities.

If we prepare teachers with the latest knowledge and skill and then place them in work situations where they cannot use this knowledge and skill, we will just produce more candidates for the drop-out list. The most severe problem in schools today is being referred to as "burnout." If any of you have attended teachers' association conferences lately, you will find that the sessions on teacher stress and on the problems of burnout are those that are most well-attended.

The conditions for real professional practice simply do not exist, either physically or psychologically, for the teacher today. The overriding goal of quality individualization and personalization of teaching and learning is not a reality in most schools. If schools continue the way they are, then in some ways, our teachers are already overtrained. More intensive and sophisticated initial preparation, combined with more formalized internships, could very easily exacerbate already existing role conflicts unless expectations for and conditions surrounding teachers are changed as well.

If the content of the university preparation program for a teacher cannot be used in the workplace of the teacher, then the university preparation will be viewed as out-of-touch and obsolete. It is imperative, therefore, that new directions in teacher education and improvement of quality programs be embedded in and consonant with equally innovative directions in school renewal.

I like Ernest Boyer's notion of the "school/college connection." Richard Wall Lyman, former president of Stanford and now president of the Rockefeller Foundation, just before he left Stanford brought together his academic council and challenged his professors, not just in the College of Education at Stanford but in the various departments of the university—"Our work with the schools will not be effective unless, to use a phrase beloved by the Quakers, it speaks to the condition of the schools, the actual condition that is, and not to some idealized form that may exist in the minds of sheltered university faculty members but is unattainable in the real world of the teacher. The real world today is perceived as less than attractive by many of the teachers who are in the profession and many of the students who are looking at alternative careers.

"The reason that the dividing line between schools and universities in this country often seems to be more like a grand canyon than a grade crossing, is because school teachers and university scholars seem to have so little sense of being involved in a common enterprise."

What is really needed is for those of us who are educators all along the continuum to see ourselves as professionals participating in the same system—the educational system, working in different parts of it, but being important links in terms of its total quality.

The major universities feel the impact of effective or ineffective performance on the part of schools quite directly in many respects. On the other hand, universities bear some responsibility for the state of affairs in the schools, whatever that state may be.

If we want the schools to recover some of their lost luster and to do a better job, we'd better start pitching in to help. If our health and our access to fossil fuels are worth the intensity of the research efforts that we seem to be declaring they are, surely the way we introduce children to the disciplined use of their minds is likewise worthy of attention. The students we help, at least some of them, will be our own someday, so everyone in this room, it seems to me, has some investment in dealing with these kinds of problems.

Now, I would like to say a word about conditions for professional practice. I understand that Secretary Bell talked about

some of the conditions schools face in terms of teacher quality today. Let me mention a few other facts, in case he did not.

What exists, it seems to me, is a situation where the society's expectations for teachers continue to expand, while at the same time, the people who are coming into the profession fall far short of being the best and most capable students.

The data that Timothy Weaver has put together is devastating. In 1980, SAT scores of high school seniors who planned to major in education were 48 points below the national average in math and 35 points below the national average in the verbal component. The college seniors in 1976 majoring in education ranked 14 out of 16 in terms of college specialties in verbal measures and next to last in math scores.

I think Joe Cronin of Illinois makes the most realistic explanation of this situation when he says, "The nation is getting exactly what it's paying for. The bottom one-third of the college population is seeking positions which pay salaries in the bottom one-third of the economy." Non-competitive salaries is the basic cause of the teacher shortage.

You may not all be aware of the extent of the shortage of quality teachers which I believe threatens the intellectual future of America. Today, there are half as many students enrolled in teacher education programs in the United States as in 1971. At the same time, there's been a simultaneous flight from teaching of large numbers of teachers hired in the late 1950's to accommodate the post-war baby boom. Changes in the employment opportunities for women in other fields coupled with the increasing number of female teachers who are heads of families has meant that many women have moved out of teaching to secure reasonable salaries. The inability of male and female teachers alike to survive as heads of households on their salaries has caused a problem.

Many people are relying on data that suggest that there's this tremendous pool of people out there who are ready to come back into teaching. An overlooked factor is that the age group from which teachers traditionally are drawn will decrease by 25 percent during the next decade. This will force education to compete with other programs within the university.

Another devastating fact was revealed in a January 1981

issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, which reported the results of a poll that is taken every year of the freshmen on various campuses to indicate career preferences. In 1971, 40 percent of the undergraduates in the 2,400 institutions indicated a preference for teaching. Last year, the number of students indicating a preference for teaching was less than five percent.

A number of black teacher educators have noted the potential impact of the current rejection of teachers as a career on the staffing patterns in urban schools. The problem in terms of the decline in the number of black teacher candidates is even worse than the problem in terms of the numbers of white teachers. The enrollment data of the black colleges reveal a similar pattern to that at Hampton Institute. Five years ago, the College of Education was the largest college on the campus of Hampton Institute; it's now the smallest.

If we want the schools to recover some of their lost luster and to do a better job, we'd better start pitching in to help.

The shortage of teacher education graduates in many parts of the country is already at the crisis stage. In Texas, for instance, the enrollment in the last four years in colleges of education went from 16,000 to 12,000, even though the numbers of students in the schools increased very dramatically and will continue to increase at a greater rate due to a rapid increase in the live birth rate as well as immigration of young families with children. The average age of people moving into Texas is 27 years old, parents in their childbearing years. By 1984, there will be a need for 985 new first-grade teachers to cover just the increases in enrollments.

In the face of this shortage the data on teacher salaries in Texas is most interesting. According to a recent study by a group of professors at Sam Houston State College, after 11 years of teaching in Texas, you can expect to make \$14,000 a year. In contrast you can graduate as a petroleum engineering student after four years of college and make \$25,000 to \$35,000 your first year on the job.

The conditions for professional teachers, it seems to me, is a subject that everyone in this room and everywhere in the country had better become concerned about. If we do not have good teachers, we are not going to have good doctors, good engineers, good lawyers, or good musicians. That is the most vivid truth, and everybody I've ever talked with has agreed with that. Yet it's not reflected in the reward system.

The Sam Houston study also identified the number of teachers who moonlight in order to survive. Teachers have to moonlight at least 13.5 hours a week while they're teaching, and they all have to work in the summer. And do you know what the data show? The total amount of money they make moonlighting is a little over \$2,000, which is a reflection of the kind of jobs they get. The image the public has is still of the teacher who teaches for ten months and plays for two. Teachers not only have to work while schools are recessed; but the kind of jobs they can get do not utilize their special skills. Here are college-educated people whose only job options for their summer stint are store-clerking, hamburger-frying and truck-driving. These are the people in whom we invest the future of this country.

Let me close by just mentioning three or four things I think that deans of graduate education and deans of other colleges in the university can do.

I think it's more important to talk about the ends than the means of this crisis. If we committed ourselves to quality in teaching and teacher education as a problem for the country, not just our colleges but for the country, we would do something tomorrow. It's a question of values that will determine how much time we give to this problem and its solutions.

First, I'd like to recommend that we work together to establish a series of merit-based fellowship/scholarship programs to attract the most capable high school graduates into teacher education. This program would stimulate the expansion and enhancement of talent with respect to teachers and would be analogous to the capitation grants provided the medical schools when there was a shortage of doctors. Criteria for the identification of such talented students in institutions that might qualify would be approached deliberately. Such an effort would be buttressed not only with rigorous standards but also with rigorous

and explicit provisions for recruitment of talented ethnic minorities.

Attached to giving such support for talented prospective teachers would be the willingness, indeed the obligation, of participating educational institutions to provide rigorous, realistic, and rational teacher preparation programs characterized by defensible and sturdy academic standards.

Not wishing to send talented prospective teachers to programs of low intellectual stimulation but to force judgments regarding program and institutional quality, the capitation grants referred to earlier could be used to stimulate needed shifts in the desired direction of defensible academic standards and relationships. If institutions had to demonstrate subject matter competence as well as ongoing research development activity, with solid and cooperative linkages to schools, in order to qualify for capitation grant participation, the two-pronged approach could be melded together into a unified and complementary effort.

Once high quality teacher education programs came to be identified and rewarded, it would enable us to demonstrate clearly and obviously to our public school communities and to the public generally that recipients of quality programs have high level teaching and subject matter skills and knowledge. Such a program could ultimately have a decided impact on state certification programs and state program approval requirements.

I would also call for a forgiveness provision to be built into student loan programs for outstanding students who would commit themselves to two years of teaching after completing their requirements.

I'd also propose that we provide incentives and support for the kind of research and development that links schools seeking to improve with colleges of education and universities willing to break out of obsolete patterns of preparation. Such programs should give serious consideration to the need for building comprehensive professional development programs for teaching personnel through such methods as cooperative teacher education centers.

Most of all, I urge that substantial support be given to schools and colleges seeking to redesign the entire learning environ-

ment of schools from the curriculum through the structure of the school through completely new inquiry approaches.

I also believe that we've got to get every state to commit at least ten percent of the block grant funds in the Consolidation Act of 1981 to staff development programs. Thirty-three of those categorical programs included some staff development money. Right now those monies are going through the block grant programs in the various states, and there is no way at the present time to put some of that funding into improving the quality of teacher education.

I also believe we ought to eliminate emergency certificates as they now exist. Let me tell you what's happening in Texas, Arizona, and a couple other states. You've got a State Board of Education that's just set up a Commission for Professional Standards, right? They've just passed a regulation—and this is true in at least 19 states in the country—to have every student entering teacher education take a competency test at the beginning and at the end to ensure competence in the basic skills.

That same State Board turns around a few meetings afterwards and passes a resolution that allows the local school district superintendent to hire on an emergency certificate basis, anybody who walks off the street who is 18 years old and has taken 90 hours of college credit.

What we've got to do is begin to get State Boards of Education and local superintendents to take some of the responsibility for the quality question. It can't all be laid on the universities.

Two or three years from now, you're going to find some fellow writing another article saying, "Those damn colleges of education and universities are putting out poorly prepared people." Unless we spread out accountability for quality control and include school superintendents as well as deans in universities, we're not going to solve this problem of quality. Instead of raising the salaries in local districts, what is happening is that the districts are hiring unqualified and incompetent people to teach their children.

In Arizona, in the past two years of experience with teacher competency tests they dropped eight percent of the students who would have come into the teacher preparation programs, and the increase in the number of emergency certificates they issued to people who were totally unqualified was twelve percent. In addi-

tion they've raised the size of classes and are dropping some of their programs.

Until we can get a commitment of the total profession to see itself in a common enterprise with that first and second grade teacher, we're not going to have improvement of quality at the graduate level, because quality at one end of the system is inextricably linked with the other end of the system.

Comment: Gregory R. Anrig

The research is good, but we don't communicate it well.

First, let me say that in what will be my brief remarks, I'm not speaking for ETS. I've only been there three months. If I had to speak for ETS on this subject, I wouldn't know what to say. Instead I'll speak as a consumer, both as a student at graduate school and as an employer of your graduate.

With regard to the question, is graduate education filling its responsibility to the schools, I feel like the "fiddler on the roof." On the one hand, but on the other hand. Or as we say at ETS, "yes, no, maybe, or none of the above." The correct answer is "D," I think, until some student in Florida finds out otherwise.

I have looked forward all day to giving a report card to deans of graduate schools, and I'm going to do that, but put your mind at ease. I'm really a fairly light marker. I had a young lady in junior high school where I taught. Every time I assigned a project to her, regardless of what I asked for, I got back an Indian and a canoe! Somehow for that kid, I always found a way to give her a D-minus or something, so she got through. I don't know what she's doing now. I guess she's at Princeton.

Not at ETS, though.

To answer the question about are you fulfilling the responsibility, I would ask another question. What are the responsibilities? One of them, I believe, is clearly to provide standards of quality in the preparation of teachers, counselors and administrators.

Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S.

Now the report card. Easy marker that I am, my report card for graduate schools in that particular responsibility is "below average to average." The standards largely, in fact, are the sum of the grades of the courses taken by the individual students, rather than any overall assessment of what the professional performance requires.

I'm a perpetual optimist. (After 25 years in government, you have to be or you don't survive.) I look at the current time of cut-backs as an opportunity, painful opportunity, but nonetheless an opportunity. When you take a look at the job market and what's happening to university budgets, it's clear that teacher and administrator preparation programs will have to be cut back. This is an instance where less is best. And I think what would be important to do is to tie that challenge, that need, that problem to raising standards, not to lowering them.

I know this goes against the understandable self-interest of graduate schools, particularly graduate schools of education and their faculties, but I would suggest that you do what the Office of Management and Budget does in government. Each year it tells each agency, you have a mark. It's called an OMB mark. It's an amount of money over which you cannot go. I would suggest you do that for your teacher and administrator preparation programs. Say there is the mark; it's lower. Now set some standards within that mark and don't take in some people in order to meet that reduction.

I would suggest that some of your schools establish Horace Mann fellowships. There should be fellows that you would be willing to stake your reputation on. Admit fewer, but make them really good. Give them a good program. Stake your reputation on them. Then your report card for standards of quality in preparation will go up. As a good teacher, I always tell you what you can do to improve.

Second, the element of support for schools. Your report card on that: I'm sorry to have to tell you that you get an "incomplete" because you're absent a lot; but there's some promise when you are in attendance. Universities and colleges generally use the schools for research and internships. In exchange for that use, you occasionally offer tuition waivers or partial tuition waivers or a thank you, or "I'll see you later."

Generally the schools benefit to some degree from that relationship but not an awful lot. That is changing, and it's changing from some of the most prestigious institutions in the country. I point out that Harvard Dean Graham's School of Education has committed itself to a priority for school leadership. President Donald Kennedy, the other day, announced what I thought was quite a clarion call at Stanford, university-wide, for the schools. I think those are encouraging signs. All of us might think of joining such movements.

In Massachusetts, in Boston, there are 24 colleges and universities that are paired with individual schools and have been for the last six years. They are really trying to do a job for those schools. I think there are some good stories out there, not only in Boston but in other cities, of the success of universities and colleges linking up with individual schools.

The fourth element, research on teaching and learning. The report card: "average to above average, and in some cases excellent." There is some research which has been very helpful, particularly the most recent research on effective schools, but generally it is not communicated well to the school and classroom level. So the research is good, but we don't communicate it well. We need to do a better job in that area.

Not enough attention is being paid to what is being learned in other countries. If we took a look at how the brightest children in the United States do compared to the brightest children in the industrialized nations of Europe and industrialized Asia, you might suspect that the verdict would be a negative one. It is not; it's positive. I think we need to find out more about how we are doing compared to other nations which are industrialized, advanced nations as we are, so we get a little bit of the American spirit back again. We're not quite as bad off as we might guess.

Another point with regard to research and learning is that we're hearing too much from sociologists. We ought to put a cap on that! Let's hear more from historians and philosophers. The reason I suggest that is not because of my good friends Jim Coleman and Sandy Jencks, but rather because there's a need to remind society in this day and age of the original purpose of public education and of the common school in a democracy such as we profess to have here in the United States. That re-

minder needs to be done and done and done and done, so when the tax cutters come along, they have to do it in that context, rather than simply in the context of the property tax. I think if we remind people of what schooling is about, we will have more support, both politically and in the general public.

Finally, the element of the in-service education. Report card: "below average to average." There's a great need there. We have very few new teachers coming into the system. The staff is getting more and more experienced, and further and further away from their past education. The problems facing them are very real and they do need help. In fact, they need so much help that they are not turning to colleges and universities any more because of disappointment. Rather, they are turning to their associations because the associations are more likely to address the problems on the terms which they want.

This kind of training is adult education. We're not talking about kids here. We're talking about experienced, well-educated professionals. The education offered has to be based on mutual respect and involvement.

For those of you in public institutions, the only way you're going to be able to work in-service education is to lick the issue of the full-time equivalent. I think that can be licked. I think you can translate off-campus service into full-time equivalent hours and charge school districts the legitimate FTE tuition costs for that. People tell me it can't be done, but my hero is the paramecium, and I believe it can be done.

Recommendations: First, recognize the self-interest of graduate education in elementary and secondary education. Your students today, tomorrow and the day after are the students who were in the elementary and secondary schools, and they're going to come to you or not come to you on the basis of that elementary and secondary experience. You do have an interest in them.

Second, if you are going to try to help the schools, think small and then do it well. I'm always nervous about the assistant professor who comes in and tells me he's going to reform the Boston public schools this term.

We don't need that kind of help, just a little modest help—constant, consistent, well-delivered. I'd be happy with that.

Don't try to reform the world, just take care of one little task. Miracles are not realistic, either for the university or for the schools. And they're not expected.

Third, draw upon your strengths as an institution and don't assume those strengths are limited to your schools of education. When I was once a superintendent in a college community, the history department of the high school and the history faculty of the college used to go over to the faculty club, drink beer and talk history. It was wonderful. It's nice to be able to talk about something other than techniques or procedures. They just talked about history or math and science. That's what teachers are interested in. I'd like to see faculties do more of that sort of thing.

[In-service] training is adult education. We're not talking about kids here. We're talking about experienced, well-educated professionals. The education offered has to be based on mutual respect and involvement.

Fourth, seek answers to tomorrow's problems of teaching and learning. The schools, for better or worse, have to deal with today's tasks, but they don't have the time or resources to deal with tomorrow's questions. That's where you can help and what you're designed to do to begin with, at least in part.

Finally, I would urge you to subject the research of some of the critics of the schools to harsher review on scholarly standards, and then speak out on the basis of that review, because the critics are certainly speaking out. It would be nice to have someone else say "That's a bunch of not very good academic work."

I hope you share with your families the report card of graduate education; your grades would be passing at the undergraduate level but they wouldn't earn you a graduate degree. As the dean said to the promising student, "You have talent, but you need to do better."

Closing Comment by Ernest L. Boyer

I think the central message of the session has been to highlight a basic social problem that inevitably impinges on colleges and universities. Schooling in this country is in trouble, and that will affect us professionally as well as individually.

One extremely complicated issue that, while not primarily in the university domain, does get us close to the nub of the problem being discussed today, is the status of teachers and teaching, especially concerning rewards and remuneration.

I think when one advises students that teaching may not be their best career choice, that's not simply a matter of building prejudice. It's a reflection of realities that we regret but that are nonetheless there. So we kid ourselves if we try to gloss over what is really a very important fact regarding the support and the financing of teaching in this country.

As you may know, the Carnegie Foundation is working on a report on secondary schools. It's very clear that the heart of the matter has to do with teachers. It's an institutional problem, but in a broader sense, it's a social problem too.

All one can do is to try to touch the variety of places where decisions about teachers are being made. Only a few of those are on the college campus. That's the second conclusion that I think we need to candidly address.

Third, to what extent does the structure called the graduate school have a direct responsibility for schools and teachers? Well, honesty requires me to say I think that—except for schools of education—we have very little direct responsibility. I am talking now of organization and structure; I am not talking of attitude.

I do however think that graduate deans in the arts and sciences carry great prestige and stature. They speak for the disciplines that historically have had clout. That's as it should be.

I think that the arts and sciences colleges do have an obligation to help wrestle with the quality of education and to use their influence to support the schools.

I also think that the university itself should honor the teaching profession. I was struck that a distinguished university regularly awards an honorary degree to a teacher each

year. After they have honored a retired general and a well-heeled philanthropist, they give recognition to a distinguished teacher. I mention that only illustratively, of course, of what universities might do to strengthen teaching.

Finally, I wonder whether graduate faculties might not be drawn together on policy questions dealing with education. Perhaps the arts and sciences—to the extent that we cross discipline lines on policy issues—might think of themselves as a resource to the schools.

Simply stated, I think that the quality of the schools is not necessarily at the top of the graduate school administrative agenda, but in terms of influence and interdisciplinary actions I believe that there is a potent strategic role for our universities to play.

PAST CHAIRMEN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- 1981 - Paul A. Albrecht
Claremont Graduate School
- 1980 - Daniel J. Zaffarano
Iowa State University
- 1979 - Robert F. Kruh
Kansas State University
- 1978 - Donald J. White
Boston College
- 1977 - J. Chester McKee, Jr.
Mississippi State University
- 1976 - Sanford S. Elberg
University of California, Berkeley
- 1975 - S. D. Shirley Spragg
University of Rochester
- 1974 - Charles T. Lester
Emory University
- 1973 - Jacob E. Cobb
Indiana State University
- 1972 - David R. Deener
Tulane University
- 1971 - Stephen H. Spurr
University of Michigan
- 1970 - Mina Rees
City University of New York
- 1969 - Alvin H. Proctor
Pittsburgh State University
- 1968 - Joseph L. McCarthy
University of Washington
- 1967 - J. Boyd Page
Iowa State University
- 1966 - Herbert D. Rhodes
University of Arizona
- 1965 - Roy F. Nichols
University of Pennsylvania
- 1964 - John W. Ashton
Indiana University
- 1963 - Bryce L. Crawford, Jr.
University of Minnesota
- 1962 - John C. Weaver
University of Iowa
- 1961 - Henry E. Bent
University of Missouri

PRESIDENTS EMERITI

Gustave O. Arlt
J. Boyd Page